

PATENT
515858-2007**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

In light of the following remarks, reconsideration and allowance of this application are respectfully requested.

I. STATUS OF THE CLAIMS AND FORMAL MATTERS

Claims 1-39 are pending in this application. The previously withdrawn claims, claims 17-39, have herewith been cancelled in accordance with 37 C.F.R. 1.144. Claims 1 and 14 have been amended to include therein limitations cancelled previously with the February 10, 2006 Amendment. Applicants request that the Examiner consider the present amendment along with the Amendment filed on February 10, 2006 before issuing an action on the merits.

II. REQUEST FOR REFUND

Applicants request a refund for the charges to the present application for the addition of claims 40-62 in the February 10, 2006 Amendment. Applicant's have herewith cancelled previously withdrawn claims 17-39. Accordingly, claims 40-62 replace canceled claims 17-39. Thus, Applicants request that the fee charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0320 on February 13, 2006 be credited as no fee is required for the added claims.

III. RECORD OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW

In a telephone interview with the Examiner which took place on February 7, 2006, the Applicants' representatives, Antonio Papageorgiou and Anthony Mustillo, discussed the rejections with respect to claims 1 and 14 and possible amendments to the claims to overcome the prior art of record. The Examiner indicated that the following subject matter proposed by the Applicants' representatives may overcome the art of record: a plunger type lock mechanism and a side block having a tapered wall bell-shaped curvilinear cross section. The Examiner further

PATENT
515858-2007

suggested adding a locking mechanism with a flexible finger to overcome the prior art. No decision was reached with regard to patentability.

IV. THE REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) and 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

The Examiner rejected claims 1-16 either under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 3,737,923 to Prolo ("Prolo") or under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Prolo in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,571,757 to Zolecki ("Zolecki"), U.S. Patent No. 5,657,766 to Durham ("Durham"), U.S. Patent No. 5,211,185 to Garth et al. ("Garth"), or U.S. Patent No. 3,957,262 to McReynolds ("McReynolds").

Applicants repeat the Arguments presented in the February 10, 2006 Amendment and that those arguments under this section be considered herewith.


CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the claims in this application are patentable over the prior art. Accordingly, allowance of claims presented above is respectfully solicited.

Please charge any fees incurred by reason of this response and not paid herewith to Deposit Account No. 50-0320.

Respectfully submitted,
FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP
Attorneys for Applicants

By:



Antonio Papageorgiou
Reg. No. 53,431
(212) 588-0800